Remarks

In response to the final Office Action, Applicants have amended claim 68, and submit the following remarks. Claims 68-71 and 75-76 are pending.

Withdrawal of Claims 72-74

In the office action, the Examiner has withdrawn claims 72-74 from further consideration, as allegedly being drawn to a non-elected invention. According to the Examiner, a method of stimulating an immune response for the treatment of *cancer* was elected in a response filed February 27, 2008. The Examiner asserts that claims 72-74 are drawn to a method wherein the antigen is viral, fungal or bacterial - which do not read on the elected invention.

Applicant reserve the option to pursue claims 72-74 in a divisional application at a later date.

Support for Amendment to Claim 68

Claim 68 has been amended to recite that the Lewis x antigen is non-sialylated. Applicants believe that a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that Applicants refer to a non-sialylated Lewis x antigen without the additional language being added to claim 68 by this amendment. It is well understood in the art that reference to a Lewis x antigen pertains to a non-sialylated Lewis x antigen. Whereas reference to a sialylated Lewis x antigen would be addressed as such.

However, in the interest of being crystal clear and gaining a timely allowance, Applicants have opted to amend claim 68 to specify that the Lewis x antigen claimed is

non-sialylated. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0004], [0025], [0147], [0193], and [0238] of the published application. Throughout the specification, Applicants teach away from using sialylated Lewis x antigens because sialylation completely abrogates the recognition of DC-SIGN. See, for example, paragraph [0004] of the published application.

Rejection under §102

Claims 68-71 and 75-76 have been rejected under §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by WO 98/39027 ('027), as evidenced by Coombs, et al. According to the Examiner, '027 teaches a method of stimulating an immune response comprising administering a glycoconjugate comprising a Lewis x antigen; that the Lewis x antigen can be conjugated to a glycolipid or to a tumor protein antigen; and that the method can be used for the treatment of cancer.

The Examiner cites Coombs, et al. as evidence that Lewis x antigens bind to the DC-SIGN receptor. Therefore, the Examiner contends that the '027 method of administering a Lewis x antigen, would "inherently" result in the administration of the antigen through a DC-SIGN receptor of the individual. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

'027 is concerned with sialylated Lewis antigens as evidenced in the title, abstract, and throughout the document. The present invention relates to non-sialylated Lewis x antigens. Most importantly, sialylated Lewis antigens do not interact with DC-SIGN as evidenced by Coombs et al. In particular, on page 22998, second column, last paragraph of Coombs, it is disclosed that DC-SIGN and SRCL are capable of binding Lewis x containing oligosaccharides, whereas only selectins and possible SRCL may bind sialylated Lewis x (See Coombs, page 22999, last paragraph).

As discussed above, the instant invention is concerned with non-sialylated Lewis x antigens. Claim 68 has been amended accordingly. Therefore, `027 as evidenced by Coombs, cannot be found to anticipate the instant invention.

It is now believed that this application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that resolution of any remaining issues can be handled via telephone, she is cordially invited to contact Applicants' Attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, New York 11791
(516) 822-3550

/lauren t emr/
Lauren T. Emr
Registration No. 46,139
Attorney for Applicants

LTE/mf